

As it comes to our environment, we don't need to do anything differently. Let's just do more of the same. Let's just give a little more money to some Federal agencies to allocate the funding, and let's just come every year and decide year in and year out if we want to or if we don't, and how that money should be allocated.

There is a group of us called Team CARA, representing the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, which has been negotiating since the beginning of this Congress for a better way—a way that will bring more money to States on a guaranteed basis, money that Governors and mayors and local elected officials can count on—a revenue sharing bill, if you will, for the environment. It is something that will turn in a direction that will set us on a new and bold and exciting course.

I thank the President for his tremendous statements in the last couple of days urging Congress to move in this direction. He is urging us to do everything we can to make CARA—the Conservation and Reinvestment Act—the model. For the RECORD, I will submit something in which some States would be interested. I will be handing out this form later today.

For instance, if we stick with the old method, Colorado would receive \$3.6 million. It is a beautiful State with wonderful environmental needs. They would get \$3.6 million. Under CARA, if it is passed, Colorado could receive \$46 million a year, and the Governor and local elected officials would have input into how it was spent.

Let's take Georgia. Under this bill, this year they would get a measly \$500,000. Under CARA, they would be guaranteed a minimum of \$32 million a year.

Let's take Kentucky. Again, they would get a measly \$500,000 in this year's environmental bill. Under CARA, they would get a guarantee of \$15 million a year for the preservation of open spaces, for wildlife conservation, and for the expansion of our parks and recreation.

Let's take Minnesota. Minnesota gets nothing in the bill being negotiated. Under CARA, they would get \$29 million a year.

I will be submitting the details because I am here to say let's allow the best proposal to win in this debate. Let us fight it on its merits. Let us discuss the benefits of CARA. These are some of the benefits that I am outlining.

New Jersey is one of our most populated States—the Garden State, a State that has just levied on its people a billion dollar bond issue to preserve open spaces. People in New Jersey feel strongly about this. Under the old way, the way the negotiators are carving this up, they get a measly \$875,000. Under CARA, they would receive \$40 million a year.

Let's take New York, another large State. They would get \$2.8 million in

the bill being negotiated, but if we stick to our guns and fight hard for CARA, New York could get \$17 million a year. Most certainly, the population deserves those kinds of numbers.

Finally, Washington State is a beautiful State, one that has a history of leading us in the environmental area. Washington gets fairly well treated in this bill with \$12.7 million. Under CARA, if we hold true to the principles, Washington State could get \$47 million a year. That is a big difference for the people of Washington State—from \$12.7 million to \$47 million. I could go on.

Under CARA, we have a guarantee. Under the current negotiations, the same that has gone on for the last 25 years, there is no guarantee. I am saying that under CARA we can have full funding for the land and water conservation, help coastal States such as Louisiana that produce the necessary revenues. Under the old way—the way that has been going on for 25 years—it has failed to meet our obligations and we get shortchanged. Under CARA, it is a real legacy. Under the negotiations, the stage is set.

I thank the Senator from Utah for giving me his remaining time. I see another Senator on the floor who may want to speak on this issue. Let me conclude by urging the Members of the Senate to focus on these negotiations, and I will be back later to give some more information on this important issue. I yield back whatever time I have remaining.

YUGOSLAV ELECTIONS AND THE SERBIA DEMOCRATIZATION ACT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, it is clear that a fair vote count in this weekend's elections will result in victory for the candidate of the opposition forces. Mr. Vojislav Kostunica. The people of Yugoslavia clearly have voted for democratic change, and the time has come for Yugoslavia's brutal dictator, Slobodan Milosevic, to have the decency to accept the will of his people and leave office peacefully.

Not surprisingly, Milosevic has indicated he intends to do no such thing. I fully expect him to do everything in his power to steal this election to enable him to remain in power.

In order to support the majority of Serbs who voted for peace and democracy, I urge my colleagues to support the Serbia Democratization Act—legislation that I introduced more than 18 months ago—designed to undermine the murderous Milosevic regime and thereby support democratic change in Serbia.

The Serbia Democratization Act calls for the United States to identify and give aid to the democratic forces in Serbia opposing Milosevic's tyranny, including independent media and non-governmental organizations in Serbia. And it makes clear that unless and

until there is a democratic government in Yugoslavia, the United States will maintain the sanctions that we have in place today.

When the Serbian people finally gain the government in Belgrade that they voted for this weekend—a government based on freedom, democracy and rule of law—I will lead an effort in Congress to ensure that the United States provides them with substantial support to assist their nation's democratic transition. I am hopeful that day will come soon.

I also commend the important role played by Montenegro in this weekend's elections. The decision by the vast majority of Montenegrins to boycott this election indicates the level of support in that republic for the course of democratic, free-market reforms proposed by President Djukanovic.

Montenegro deserves the support of the United States, and can serve as an example to the people of Serbia regarding the benefits they could enjoy in a post-Milosevic era.

STOP TAX-EXEMPT ARENA DEBT ISSUANCE ACT

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, early this Congress, I introduced S. 224, the Stop Tax-Exempt Arena Debt Issuance Act or STADIA for short. This bill would end a tax subsidy that inures largely to the benefit of wealthy sports franchise owners, by eliminating tax-subsidized financing of professional sports facilities. This legislation would close a loophole that provides an unintended Federal subsidy—in fact, contravenes Congressional intent—and that contributes to the enrichment of persons who need no Federal assistance whatsoever.

This is the fourth time I have introduced this legislation, and I chose to keep the original effective date for a number of reasons. Most importantly, because Congress intended to eliminate the issuance of tax-exempt bonds to finance professional sports facilities as part of the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

At the same time, I recognized that a few localities may have expended significant time and funds in planning and financing a professional sports facility, in reliance upon professional advice on their ability to issue tax-exempt bonds. Thus, in my original introductory statement, I specifically requested comment regarding the need for equitable relief for stadiums already in the planning stages.

In response to my request, several localities that had been planning to finance professional sports facilities with tax-exempt bonds came forward and provided the details necessary to craft appropriate “binding contract” type transitional relief. Accordingly, I agreed to change the bill in subsequent Congresses to exempt projects which had progressed to a point where it would be unfair to stop them.

Now I have been contacted by others who make the case that retaining the 1996 effective date creates a lack of certainty which is unhealthy for communities desiring new stadiums and for the bond market itself. Therefore, I am inserting into the record my intention to modify the effective date if and when S. 224 is adopted in committee or on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I ask that this language be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to bonds issued on or after January 19, 1999—

(2) EXCEPTION FOR CONSTRUCTION, BINDING AGREEMENTS, OR APPROVED PROJECTS.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to bonds—

(A) The proceeds of which are used for—

(i) the construction or rehabilitation of a facility—

(I) if such construction or rehabilitation began before January 19, 1999 and was completed on or after such date, or

(II) if a State or political subdivision thereof has entered into a binding contract before January 19, 1999 that requires the incurrence of significant expenditures for such construction or rehabilitation and some of such expenditures are incurred on or after such date; or

(ii) the acquisition of a facility pursuant to a binding contract entered into by a State or political subdivision thereof before January 19, 1999, and

(B) which are the subject of an official action taken by relevant government officials before January 19, 1999—

(i) approving the issuance of such bonds, or

(ii) approving the submission of the approval of such issuance to a voter referendum.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR FINAL BOND RESOLUTIONS.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to bonds the proceeds of which are used for the construction or rehabilitation of a facility if a State or political subdivision thereof has adopted a final bond resolution before January 19, 1999, authorizing the issuance of such bonds. For this purpose, a final bond resolution means that all necessary governmental approvals for the issuance of such bonds have been completed.

(4) SIGNIFICANT EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(A)(i)(II), the term 'significant expenditures' means expenditures equal to or exceeding 10 percent of the reasonably anticipated cost of the construction or rehabilitation of the facility involved.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to report language in the Senate version of the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, which directs the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) to spend 20 percent of its budget on "nation-building" activities in four war-stricken areas. The language appears in the committee report. Although the language is not mandatory, it sends a strong message

that compliance by NED is expected. I believe that the language should be deleted.

I would like to commend the work of the chairman and ranking member of the CJS Appropriations subcommittee, Senator GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS, for providing the NED with the resources to conduct its vital work. NED and its four core institutes do an exceptional job in assisting grassroots democrats in more than 80 countries around the world. NED has a strong track record, developed through involvement in virtually every critical struggle for democracy over the past fifteen years. NED supported the democratic movements that helped bring about peaceful transitions to democracy in Poland, the Czech Republic, Chile, and South Africa. NED is also playing an important role in supporting some of the newer democracies, such as Indonesia, Nigeria, Croatia, and Mexico.

I am very familiar with the work of NED and its institutes because I serve on NED's Board of Directors. I serve on the Board along with two other Senators and two Members of the House representing both political parties. We are all concerned about the implications of the committee's report language on the operations and mission of the Endowment.

In its report, the committee recommends that NED spend 20 percent of its entire budget to reconstitute civil governments in four seriously troubled areas—Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kosovo, and East Timor. I am pleased to report that NED is working in each of these areas on long-term democratic development. The Endowment is helping non-governmental organizations, whose leaders are facing grave danger to their personal safety, as they report on human rights abuses, campaign for peace, and provide independent news and information to the public.

We need to keep in mind that NED's mission is not to "build" nations or governments, but to help promote democracy. It does this giving a helping hand to those inside other countries through financial and technical assistance to nurture a strong civil society and market economy. NED is successful precisely because it targets its assistance to grassroots democratic groups.

I do not support the report language because its implementation would undermine NED's mission while forcing NED to withdraw scarce resources from other priority countries. It would be a mistake to divert NED's modest budget to a handful of crisis situations which are already receiving enormous sums of international assistance. It is unlikely that the funds suggested in the report language could positively impact these war-torn areas, but by consuming 20 percent of NED's budget, the language

will hamstring NED's ability to perform its work in many other critical countries.

NED is a cost-effective investment that advances our national interest and our fundamental values of democracy and freedom. It is crucial, therefore, that we address the committee's goals in the report language without compromising the ability of NED to carry out its work effectively.

I urge the Senate and House conferees on the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill to delete the report language directing the NED to expend funds for nation-building activities in four troubled conflicts.

REIMPORTATION OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in recent days we have heard a lot about various proposals that would allow for the reimportation of prescription drugs. Patients pay more for the prescription drugs in the United States than anywhere else in the world. That is just not right. The Senate passed a proposal that Senator JEFFORDS and I authored that would allow for the reimportation of prescription drugs as long as certain steps are taken to ensure safety for American consumers.

I am pleased that the Administration and the Republican leaders in Congress have agreed to work together to take this common sense step towards making prescription drugs more affordable for everyone. Dr. David Kessler, former head of the FDA, has sent me a letter expressing his support for the Senate version of the reimportation language. Dr. Kessler agrees that we must reform the current system so that American consumers have access to safe and affordable medicine. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from David Kessler for the Dorgan-Jeffords proposal in which he expresses support for our approach.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SEPTEMBER 13, 2000.

Hon. BYRON DORGAN,
719 Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DORGAN: Thank you very much for your letter of Sept. 12, 2000. I very much applaud the effort that you and your colleagues are making to assure that the American people have access to the highest quality medicines. As you know, my concerns about the reimportation of prescription drugs center around the issues of assuring quality products. The Senate Bill which allows only the importation of FDA approved drugs, manufactured in approved FDA facilities, and for which the chain of custody has been maintained, addresses my fundamental concerns. The requirement that the importer maintain a written record of the chain of custody and batch testing to assure the product is both authentic and unadulterated provides an important safety net for consumers.